

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

For the Examiner's convenient reference, a complete listing of the pending claims of this application is set forth above.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 21, 25, 26, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Hisatomi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,933) in view of Ota (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,102).

Claim 1 is directed to a document management device including a control section with a document obtaining section which uses an identification number extracted from a received image to search for and obtain, from among documents in a memory section, the document which has the identification number. The control section also includes a judging section for judging whether summary information extracted from the received image is correct with respect to the document obtained by the document obtaining section.

Hisatomi et al. discloses a "process of fetching out an image data." See, e.g., col. 9, lines 56-57. In this process, a document ID is obtained from a marked sheet. The document ID is supplied to a document image managing means 103, which finds a storage location corresponding to the document ID and then reads out a corresponding image file from the storage location. Hisatomi et al. does not disclose or suggest the concept of "summary information" as specified in claim 1 and thus does not disclose or suggest the "double check" feature of this claim in which output of a document is based on both an identification number and summary information.

The office action recognizes the deficiency of Hisatomi et al. in this regard and relies on Ota to purportedly remedy this deficiency. In particular, the office action alleges with reference to col. 6, lines 22-44 that Ota describes the claimed use of extracted summary information and that it would have been obvious "to combine the image retrieval system of Ota with the document retrieval system of Hisatomi et al. to implement the retrieval of files using image summary information and identification."

The referenced portion of Ota describes "an image retrieving mode for retrieving any registered image file." After an image has been read and scanned by a scanner, features are extracted from the image and used to generate key information. Specifically, image scanner 100 reads out an image of a document and stores the image in memory unit 330 as an "input image." Features are extracted from this input image and "key information" is generated based thereon. This key information is used to retrieve image files from storage section 440. See also Figure 4. As described at col. 7, lines 18-23 of Ota:

When an image file is to be retrieved, the operation for retrieval is also easy because key information for retrieval is generated by automatically extracting features in the image of a document and an appropriate image file is retrieved by using the key information for retrieval.

Even assuming for the sake of argument that proper motivation could be identified for combining Hisatomi et al. and Ota, the result would not have been the subject matter of claim 1 in which a judging section judges whether extracted summary information is correct with respect to a document obtained by a document obtaining section. Ota discloses that key information (which the office action appears to equate to the claimed summary information) generated from an image is used as an alternative when no keyword or title information is supplied. See Ota, col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 12. Consequently, even assuming Hisatomi et al. and Ota were to be combined, the combination would (at best) result in finding a document using the image key information of Ota as an alternative to the document ID of Hisatomi et al. There is no suggestion to combine Hisatomi et al. nor Ota so as to first find a document using an ID mark and to then judge that document using the "key information."

In short, Hisatomi et al. discloses retrieving documents using an identification number and Ota discloses retrieving documents using key information based on features extracted from a document. These techniques constitute alternate approaches for retrieving documents and would at best be suggestive of substituting one for the other under certain circumstances. There is no basis for combining Hisatomi et al. and Ota so that both approaches are provided in a single device. That is, Hisatomi et al. and Ota are not suggestive of a device having a "double-check" feature in which a document is retrieved based on an identification number and thereafter a determination is made as to whether to output the document based on a judgment involving "summary information" (e.g., key information) as specified in claim 1 and its dependent claims.

The office action also mentions on page 4 that "motivation to combine the references is clear because Ota teaches that using keyword/title to retrieve is not efficient method for image retrieval ..."

First, Hisatomi et al. uses an identification number to retrieve documents, not "keyword/title". Because Hisatomi et al. does not use keyword/title, there would be no motivation to provide the Ota techniques in Hisatomi et al. to remedy the alleged inefficiency.

Second, even assuming for the sake of argument that "keyword/title" were used, Ota would be suggestive of replacing this keyword/title technique with his key information technique, not of adding his technique to an admittedly inefficient technique.

Claims 21 and 25 and their dependent claims call for searching for and obtaining, from among documents in a memory section, a document having an extracted identification number and then judging whether extracted summary information is correct with respect to the obtained document. For the reasons set forth above, the proposed combination of Hisatomi et al. and Ota is likewise deficient with respect to these claims.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over the proposed Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination, in further view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,429). In connection with claim 2, the office action relies on Takahashi et al. as showing the claimed communication network. Takahashi et al. at least fails to provide the portions of claim 1 (from which claim 2 depends) that are missing from the Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination and consequently claim 2 is believed to patentably distinguish over the proposed combination for at least this reason.

Claims 5-12 and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over the proposed Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination, further in view of Jeran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,412). Jeran et al. is cited for its disclosure of printing information such as a version number or a code for authorization on a document. When the document is later scanned, the information can be used to track the document or to determine whether a particular person has permission to copy the document. These teachings are in a different context than the subject matter of claims 5-12 and 28-31. In Jeran et al., the information is associated with a document in a person's possession and is used to track the document or to determine whether that document can be copied. In the context of claim 8, for example, the presence/absence of

approval information is used to determine whether to output a document. Accordingly, in addition to failing to remedy the deficiencies of Hisotami et al. and Ota in connection with the claims from which claims 5-12 and 28-31 depend, Jeran et al. fails to render obvious the subject matter of these claims.

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over the proposed Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination, further in view of Fukushima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,293,256) and Dieterman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,704). In connection with claims 23 and 24, the office action adds Fukushima et al. and Dieterman et al. to the proposed Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination. The document management system of claims 23 and 24 each includes a document management device along the lines of claim 1 and thus the Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination is lacking with respect to this subject matter for the reasons set forth above. Fukushima et al. and Dieterman et al. at least fail to remedy the deficiencies of Hisatomi et al. and Ota in this regard and claims 23 and 24 are believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over the proposed Hisatomi et al.-Ota combination, further in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,313,572). Yamamoto et al. discloses a filing system that scans original documents and converts the information into picture information that is condensed (reduced) for storage. See, e.g., Abstract. The portions of Yamamoto et al. referenced in the office action relate to reducing/enlarging a series of data to conform to a coordinate input area of a coordinate input device 110. This is not at all suggestive of providing the input image of Ota as a reduced image. Consequently, in addition to failing to remedy the deficiencies of Hisatomi et al. and Ota in connection with claim 25 from which claim 27 depends, Yamamoto et al. fails to render obvious the subject matter of this claim.

NAGATA

Appl. No. 09/729,426

Response to Office Action dated February 24, 2006

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael J. Shea", written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Shea  
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100